

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re Patent Application of:	)Attorney Docket No.: F-235
Frederick W. Ryan, Jr.	)Group Art Unit: 3628
Serial No.: 09/777,592	)Examiner: N. Erb
Filed: Feb. 5, 2001	)Date: April 29, 2008

Confirmation No.: 3158

Title: Mail Piece Verification System Having Forensic Accounting Capability

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RESPONSE TO NOTIFICATION OF NON-COMPLIANT APPEAL BRIEF**

Sir:

In response to the Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2008, attached please find Section III of the Brief, Status of Claims, in which the canceled claims have been identified.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. **16-1885**.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian A. Lemm/  
Brian A. Lemm  
Reg. No. 43,748  
Attorney for the Appellants  
Telephone (203) 924-3836

PITNEY BOWES INC.  
Intellectual Property and  
Technology Law Department  
35 Waterview Drive  
Shelton, Connecticut 06484-8000

### III. Status of Claims

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17 and 19-21 have been canceled. Claims 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 14, 16, 18 and 22-24 are pending in this application and are on appeal. Claims 2, 4, 9 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunter (U.S. 5,280,531) in view of Moore (U.S. 5,917,925) and further in view of Connell et al. (U.S. 4,933,849). Claims 7 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunter in view of Moore and Connell et al. and further in view of Berson (U.S. 5,819,239). Claims 16 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunter in view of Connell et al. Claims 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunter in view of Moore and Connell et al. and further in view of Fleming (U.S. 5,953,710). Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunter in view of Connell et al. and further in view of Fleming.